



REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
SEATTLE DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
P.O. BOX 3755
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98124-3755

20 Sept 2005

Military Unit
Contracting Division

SUBJECT: Two-Phase Design-Build Selection Procedures for Request for Proposals (RFP)
Number W912DW-05-R-0041, entitled "FY06 Special Operations Forces (SOF) Special Forces
Group (SFG) Compound Expansion, Ft. Lewis, WA"

TO: PROSPECTIVE OFFERORS

PHASE ONE (TECHNICAL QUALIFICATIONS)
DESIGN-BUILD EVALUATION PROCEDURES

PAPERLESS PUBLICATION NOTICE

<http://www.nws.usace.army.mil/ct/ebs/>

Any subsequent revisions to this notice will be reflected on this web page. Offerors are responsible for checking this web page to acquire any updates. The Government will not mail, fax, or e-mail this Pre-Qualification Notice. The Government web site is occasionally inaccessible due to maintenance. The Government is not responsible for any loss of Internet connectivity or for an offeror's inability to access or download this document. **TECHNICAL INQUIRIES** (DrChecks) are to be submitted via the Internet at www.projnet.org. A password is required. Bidders can obtain their password by going to (www.projnet.org), clicking on Bidder Inquiry, filling out the form provided, and then clicking Continue. Enter the project specific Key Code of **267EGA-2ADDIF**. Enter your question and click Submit Inquiry. You will receive acknowledgement of your question via email, followed by an answer to your question after it has been processed by our technical team.

This solicitation will be conducted in accordance with procedures outlined in Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) Part 36.3 entitled "Two-Phase Design-Build Selection Procedures." Award of this project is **SUBJECT TO THE AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS**. In **Phase One (Technical Qualification)**, submittals will be evaluated based on their demonstrated qualifications, experience, and past performance to determine which offerors shall submit proposals for **Phase Two (e.g., Sustainability, Extent of Small Business Participation, and Price Proposal)**. After evaluating Phase-One proposals, the Seattle District Corps of Engineers' Contracting Officer shall select the most highly qualified offerors (not to exceed five (5)), and request that only those offerors submit Phase-Two proposals. Phase Two will require technical (e.g., Sustainability, Extent of Small Business Participation), and price proposals which will be evaluated separately, in accordance with FAR Part 15. A contract will be awarded to the firm

submitting the proposal that conforms to the RFP, is considered to offer the most advantageous offer in terms of the evaluation factors, including price, and is determined to be in the best interest of the Government. PLEASE NOTE: It is expected that the design build team presented in Phase One will be exactly the same as proposed in Phase Two. If any change in this team is provided in the Phase Two proposal, the offeror is to notify the Contracting Officer in writing and demonstrate how any new individuals or firms are as qualified for this project as those submitted with Phase One of the procurement.

The successful design-build contractor will design and construct the FY06 Special Operations Forces (SOF) Special Forces Group (SFG) Compound Expansion, Ft. Lewis, WA. The work will consist of design and construction to include, but not limited to the expansion of the following buildings including related site work: Company Operations Buildings 9177 and 9178, Group Headquarters Building 9160; Battalion Headquarters Buildings 9160 and 9162, Company Supply Operations Building 9181, and an associated Warehouse Building. Solicitation documents will include conceptual plans for both the buildings and sites. Contractor(s) design and construction shall be based on completing the designs as presented in the solicitation documents since the completed project is to function as depicted in the documents.

Period of performance is 540 calendar days. The price range for this project is between \$10,000,000 and \$25,000,000.

The North American Industry Classification System code is 236220, and for the purposes of this procurement, a concern is considered a small business if its annual average gross revenue, taken for the last 3 fiscal years, does not exceed \$28.5 million. This project is open to both large and small business.

NOTICE TO LARGE BUSINESS: If you are a large business and your proposal will exceed \$1 million, you will be required to submit a subcontracting plan with goals for small, HUBZone, small disadvantaged, small woman-owned, small veteran-owned concerns, and veteran-owned small disadvantaged business. The subcontracting goals for the Seattle District which will be considered in the negotiation of this contract are: (1) at least 70% of a contractor's intended subcontract amount be placed with Small Businesses (SB); (2) at least 10% of a contractor's intended subcontract amount be placed with Small Disadvantaged Businesses (SDB) or Historically Black College or University and Minority institution; and, (3) at least 10% of a contractor's intended subcontract amount be placed with Women-Owned Small Business (WOSB), (4) at least 3% of a contractor's intended subcontract amount be placed with Veteran Owned Small Business (VOSB); (5) at least 3% of a contractor's intended subcontract amount be placed with Veteran Owned Small Business (VOSB); (5) at least 3% of a contractor's intended subcontract amount be placed with Service-Disabled Veteran owned Small Business (SDVOB); and (6) at least 3% of a contractor's intended subcontract amount be placed with HUB zones. This subcontracting plan is required to be submitted along with the Phase Two proposal.

PHASE ONE EVALUATION FACTORS – SUBMISSION OF EXPERIENCE, QUALIFICATIONS, AND PAST PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

1. PHASE ONE EVALUATION FACTORS: Offerors shall be evaluated for the following criteria, listed in descending order of importance:

A. Offeror Relevant Experience

- (1) Experience of the firms proposed for the design-build team with similar projects (e.g., projects on military installations and/or administrative/office buildings with similar scope, cost, and complexity)
- (2) Experience of the design-build team proposed for this project working together, as a team, on projects (design-build or non-design-build).
- (3) Experience of the firms proposed for the design-build team with projects involving the successful incorporation of sustainable design techniques and technology as they relate to site and building design, construction and operation.

B. Qualifications of proposed team members (e.g., education, experience, professional registration, etc.)

C. Offeror Past performance, including customer satisfaction, quality, & timely performance.

2. SUMMARY OF ORDER OF IMPORTANCE: A summary of the order of importance for the Phase-One criteria is as follows:

Criterion A is more important than each of criterion B and criterion C.

Criterion B is equal in importance to criterion C.

3. TECHNICAL MERIT RATINGS:

OUTSTANDING - Information submitted demonstrates offeror's **potential to significantly exceed performance or capability standards**. The offeror has clearly demonstrated an understanding of all aspects of the requirements to the extent that timely and the highest quality performance are anticipated. **Has exceptional strengths that will significantly benefit the Government**. The offeror convincingly demonstrated that the RFP requirements have been analyzed, evaluated, and synthesized into approaches, plans, and techniques that, when implemented, should result in outstanding, effective, efficient, and economical performance under the contract. **Significantly exceeds most or all solicitation requirements. VERY HIGH PROBABILITY OF SUCCESS.**

ABOVE AVERAGE - Information submitted demonstrates offeror's **potential to exceed performance or capability standards**. **Has one or more strengths that will benefit the Government**. The areas in which the offeror exceeds the requirements are anticipated to result in a high level of efficiency or productivity or quality. The submittal contains excellent features that will likely produce results very beneficial to the Government. **Fully meets all RFP requirements and significantly exceeds many of the RFP requirements. Disadvantages are minimal. HIGH PROBABILITY OF SUCCESS.**

SATISFACTORY (Neutral) - Information submitted demonstrates offeror's **potential to meet performance or capability standards. An acceptable solution is provided.** Either meets all RFP requirements for the criterion or contains weaknesses in some areas that are offset by strengths in other areas. A rating of "Satisfactory" indicates that, in terms of the specific criterion (or sub-criterion), the offeror has a reasonable probability of success, as there is sufficient confidence that a fully compliant level of performance will be achieved. The proposal demonstrates an adequate understanding of the scope and depth of the RFP requirements. **No significant advantages or disadvantages.** Equates to neutral. **REASONABLE PROBABILITY OF SUCCESS.**

MARGINAL – The submittal is **not adequately responsive or does not address the specific criterion.** The offeror's interpretation of the Government's requirements is **so superficial, incomplete, vague, incompatible, incomprehensible, or incorrect as to be considered deficient. Proposal does not meet some of the minimum requirements.** The assignment of a rating within the bounds of "Marginal" indicates that **mandatory corrective action would be required to prevent significant deficiencies from affecting the overall project.** The offeror's plans or approach will likely result in questionable quality of performance, which represents a moderate level of risk to the Government. Low probability of success although the submittal has a reasonable chance of becoming at least acceptable. **Significant disadvantages. LOW PROBABILITY OF SUCCESS.**

UNSATISFACTORY – **Fails to meet performance or capability standards. Unacceptable. Requirements can only be met with major changes to the submittal.** There is no reasonable expectation that acceptable performance would be achieved. The proposal contains many deficiencies and/or gross omissions; fails to provide a reasonable, logical approach to fulfilling much of the Government's requirements; and/or fails to meet most or all of the minimum requirements. **Very significant disadvantages. VERY LOW PROBABILITY OF SUCCESS.**

4. Definitions of Strength, Weakness, and Deficiency:

Strength: A substantive aspect, attribute, or specific item in the proposal that exceeds the solicitation requirements and enhances the probability of successful contract performance.

Weakness: A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance (i.e., meets the RFP requirements, but may have an impact on schedule or quality requirements). A **weakness need not be corrected** for a proposal to be considered for award, but **may** affect the offeror's rating.

Deficiency: A material failure of a proposal to meet the Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of contract performance at an unacceptable level. A deficiency **must be corrected** for a proposal to be considered for award.

5. Submittal Requirements for Phase One

5.1 General Submittal Requirements for Phase One.

Offerors must **submit information** for the above criteria **in sufficient detail to permit proper evaluation**. Submittals must be in a format that follows the sequence of criteria set forth in the paragraphs above. Absence of information will be deemed as if no support for that criterion is available. Submittals should be on 8½ x 11-inch paper, to the maximum extent practicable, and submitted in standard letter-size, loose-leaf binders. Contents of binders should be tabbed and labeled with a Table of Contents for easy identification, **with all pages numbered sequentially**. No material should be incorporated by reference; any such material will not be considered for evaluation.

Submittals are not to exceed a total of 45 pages. Only the first forty-five pages of a submission will be evaluated. Photographs and organizational charts will not be considered a page. However, a photograph with more than 6 lines of text (for caption purposes) counts as one page. Double-sided pages count as two pages. Excessive proposals may be construed as an indication of the offeror's lack of cost-consciousness and risk not being evaluated.

5.2 Specific Submittal Requirements for Phase One (Pre-Qualification)

5.2.1 Criterion A(1). Experience of the firms proposed for the design-build team with similar projects (e.g., projects on military installations and/or administrative/office buildings of similar scope, cost and complexity)

Submittal Requirements for Criterion A(1). Provide a **list** of specific projects, using the format below, including projects for **both** the construction and the design firms that are either currently under construction or were completed within the last seven (7) years. List a minimum of three (3) and a maximum of five (5) projects for this criterion. Start with the most recent and relevant projects and work backwards in time.

Project Title & Location
Project Type (e.g., design-build (DB), design (D), construction (C))
Dollar Value (design \$; construction \$)
Start & Completion Dates (Month/Year)
Role of Firm(s) (e.g., prime, sub) (address type of work performed and percentage of work, as applicable)
Brief Description of Project (address how this relates to solicitation project)
Sustainable Design Features/LEED Certification of Project
Customer Point of Contact (i.e., name, relationship to project, agency/firm affiliation, city, state, current phone no.)
Awards or recognition received (if applicable)

Criterion A(2). Experience of the design-build team proposed for this project working together, as a team, on projects (design-build or non-design-build).

Submittal Requirements for Criterion A(2). Provide a **narrative** describing the team's experience working together and the approach as a team to ensure this project's success. Provide an overall summary **matrix**, structured to show the projects on one axis and the team members that have worked together on the project on another axis.

Using the format similar to that shown above, provide specific information on no more than five (5) design-build projects or, if applicable, (5) non-design-build projects, either currently under construction (at least 75% complete) or completed within the last 7 years, on which the team members (firms and/or individuals) have worked together as a team. Start with the most recent and relevant projects and work backwards in time.

Criterion A(3). Experience of the firms proposed for the design-build team with projects involving the successful incorporation of sustainable design techniques and technology as they relate to site and building design, construction and operation.

Submittal Requirements for Criterion A(3). Provide information on a minimum of three (3) previous projects involving LEED design and briefly explain measures taken to achieve certification and LEED certification level for the project. Identify qualified LEED Professionals who worked on one or more of these projects who are to be members of the Design Team proposed for this project.

Using the format similar to that shown above, provide specific information on no more than five (5) design-build projects or, if applicable, (5) non-design-build projects, either currently under construction (at least 75% complete) or completed within the last 7 years, on which the team members (firms and/or individuals) have worked together as a team. Start with the most recent and relevant projects and work backwards in time.

Evaluation Method for Criterion A (including A(1), A(2), and A(3)). Teams will be evaluated on the quantity (up to the project maximums specified above) and quality of their experience. Projects that are more relevant and recent, and projects of similar dollar value to the subject project will be more highly rated. Design-build projects will be considered more relevant than non-design-build projects. Demonstration of experience in completing projects with the unique characteristics of the proposed project will be evaluated more favorably. Projects involving design/build, Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification from the US Green Building Council, and attributes similar to those specified (e.g. projects on military installations and/or administrative/office buildings) may be given more consideration. Design-build experience working together as a team will be considered more relevant than non-design-build experience working together. In addition, this criterion will be evaluated for the quality of prior team relationships and how the relationships of the team members will be used to achieve success on this project. Firms with limited experience working with their proposed team members should explain how they will overcome the limited experience to achieve success on this project. A DESIGN-BUILD project is defined as a project where the successful contractor is responsible for both the design and construction of a complete and usable facility in accordance with the requirements of the request for proposals. SUSTAINABLE DESIGN is defined as using

an integrated design approach and emphasizing environmental stewardship, especially energy and water conservation and efficiency, use of recovered and recycled materials, waste reduction, reduction or elimination of toxic and harmful substances in facilities construction and operation, efficiency in resource and materials utilization, and development of healthy, safe and productive work environments.

5.2.2 Criterion B. Qualifications of proposed team members (e.g., education, experience, professional registration, etc.).

Submittal Requirements for Criterion B. Provide the qualifications of the KEY individual team members (**both** construction and design) proposed for this project in the form of **resumes**. Resumes should be no more than three (3) pages per individual and submitted in a format similar to the one shown below. In addition, the Offeror shall provide a concise summary of the duties and responsibilities for each of the proposed individuals which clearly indicates separate duties and responsibilities for each of the key team members listed below. The proposal must clearly present the separate credentials for the proposed candidate of each position. For each individual's project experience, provide the same information and in the same format as described in 5.2.1 above. It is expected that the proposed key team members will be the individuals who perform work under the contract. **The contracting officer must approve substitute personnel.**

As a minimum, provide resumes for the following individuals:

Construction: On-site Project Manager, On-site Superintendent

Design: Design Project Manager, Lead Design Members (specifically, Lead Architect, Lead Design Engineers, Structural, Mechanical, Electrical, Civil, Geotechnical Engineer, Landscape Architect, and LEED Accredited Professional), and Quality Control Systems Manager

Individual's qualifications will be measured against the following criteria:

Construction Project Manager: The Construction Project Manager shall have a baccalaureate degree in engineering, architecture or construction management or equivalent with a minimum of 7 years experience managing construction projects and management of a minimum of 2 projects that demonstrate the ability to manage construction projects similar in scope, cost and complexity as the project in this solicitation **OR** a person in the construction field with a minimum of 10 years experience managing construction projects and management of a minimum of 2 projects of the same scope, cost and complexity as the project in this solicitation. If the proposed candidate received a degree, state as such. Provide specific project information for each year of experience.

Project Superintendent: The Project Superintendent shall have no less than 7 years of experience as a project superintendent on construction projects of similar scope, cost and complexity. The experience must demonstrate construction knowledge, the ability to manage large subcontracting teams, complex projects, and multiple buildings, and be consistent with the

type of construction required in this solicitation. Provide specific project information for each year of experience.

Design Project Manager: The Design Project Manager shall have a baccalaureate degree in architecture or engineering, with a minimum of 7 years project management experience and having managed a minimum of 3 projects that demonstrate the ability to manage projects similar in scope, cost and complexity to the project in this solicitation. If the proposed candidate received a degree, state as such. Provide specific project information for each year of experience.

Lead Design Members (Lead architect, mechanical, electrical, civil, structural, geotechnical engineer, landscape architect, and LEED accredited professional): Lead design team members shall have a baccalaureate degree in architecture and/or engineering, shall be registered/licenses to practice in the State of Washington, and shall have a minimum of 5 years as senior or lead designers. In addition, each individual shall have worked on at least one project of similar scope, cost and complexity to the project in this solicitation. If the proposed candidate received a degree, state as such. Provide specific project information for each year of experience.

Quality Control System Manager: The Contractor shall identify as Contractor Quality Control System Manager (CQCSM) an individual within the onsite work organization who shall be responsible for overall management of CQC and have the authority to act in all CQC matters for the Contractor. The CQCSM shall have a baccalaureate degree in engineering, architecture, or construction management, with a minimum of 5 years construction experience on construction similar to this project **OR** a construction person with a minimum of 10 years in related work. The CQCSM shall be on the site at all times during construction, shall be assigned no other duties and shall be employed by the prime Contractor. If the proposed candidate received a degree, state as such. Provide specific project information for each year of experience.

NOT PROVIDING INFORMATION ON EACH OF THESE DISCIPLINES MAY RESULT IN A LOWER RATING FOR THIS CRITERION.

Name/Title
Proposed Duties/Functions (for this project)
Firm Affiliation/Years Affiliated
Years of Experience (performing duties/functions as proposed for this project)
Education (Degree, Year, Specialization)
Active Registrations (and/or Professional/Technical Licenses/Certifications)
Specific Qualifications (for this project, if any)
List of Relevant Projects Including:
Project Title & Location
Project Type (e.g., design-build (DB), design (D), construction (C))
Dollar Value (design \$; construction \$)
Name of employing firm

Start & Completion Dates (Month/Year)
Duties/Functions (address how this relates to role for solicitation project)
Brief Description of Project (address how this relates to solicitation project)
Sustainable Design/LEED Certification Status
Customer Point of Contact (i.e., name, relationship to project, agency/firm affiliation, city, state, current phone no.)
Awards or recognition received (if applicable)

It is expected that the team presented in Phase One will be exactly the same as proposed in Phase Two. If any change is provided in the Phase Two proposal, the offeror shall demonstrate how any new individuals or firms are as qualified for this project as those submitted with the first phase of this procurement.

Evaluation Method for Criterion B. The more relevant and recent the team members' qualifications, prior project experience, and active registrations, the higher the rating assigned for this criterion during evaluations. In addition, qualifications of key personnel that demonstrate experience and training in sustainable design and/or construction will be considered favorably. Only one individual for each of the key personnel categories listed above will be evaluated.

5.2.3 Criterion C. Past performance, including customer satisfaction, quality, and timely performance

Submittal Requirements for Criterion C. In accordance with FAR 42.1503(e), past performance of the prime contractor will be evaluated using the Construction Contract Administration Support System (CCASS) database and customer satisfaction surveys. All performance ratings for the prime contractor for contracts completed within the past three (3) years shall be considered. If an offeror does not have past performance available in CCASS, the Customer Satisfaction Surveys will be used exclusively. A lack of past performance information will result in a neutral rating during evaluation. Government databases will be checked and previous customers may be contacted as references. Should the offerors want to review the CCASS ratings contained in the Corps of Engineers CCASS Database, they may request the information by fax on company letterhead at the following telefax number: (503) 808-4596. All design build projects submitted on a Customer Satisfaction Survey must have been completed within the last three (3) years. Further instructions are found at the top of the Customer Satisfaction Survey. Only relevant projects (of similar scope, cost and complexity as this solicitation) should be included on the surveys. The Government reserves the right to contact the evaluator on previous government or private section work to verify the offeror's construction experience.

Offerors shall submit a **list** of all customers (including current Point of Contact, phone number, and electronic address) to whom a Customer Satisfaction Survey was provided. A reproducible Customer Satisfaction Survey form is provided at the end of this Section 00110. **NO MORE THAN FOUR (4) CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEYS SHOULD BE SUBMITTED FOR THE PRIME FIRM.** To be considered, the surveys must be completed by the customers and mailed, emailed, hand-delivered, or faxed direction by the customer to the Seattle District Contracting Division for receipt no later than the time and date proposals are due.

Surveys submitted directly by offerors will not be considered. Please ensure envelopes containing surveys submitted to this office do not contain the offeror's return address.

Evaluation Method. The Government will evaluate the relative merits of each offeror's past performance. The Government reserves the right to consider all aspects of an offeror's performance history, but will attribute more significance to work that was similar in nature, magnitude, and complexity to this project, and will attribute more significance in evaluating the performance of those projects listed in the first criterion, Offeror Relevant Experience

5.2.4 Provide the Following Additional Information with the Submittals for Phase One:

a. An information page containing complete name, address, telephone number, fax number, e-mail address and points of contact for each firm proposed as a team member.

b. The name, point of contact, phone number, and address for the bank and the bonding company of the firm signing the SF 1442. Financial capacity will be checked, but not rated.

5.3 ONE ORIGINAL AND FIVE (5) COPIES OF SUBMITTALS ARE REQUIRED, in the format specified above, to reach the Seattle District Corps of Engineers Contracting Division Office no later than 2:00 p.m., Local Time, on **20 Oct 2005**. Due to heightened security at this facility, individuals will have to check in with the guards at the entrance and have any boxes go through a scanning device. Please allow enough time for processing through the security system. The office is located at 4735 E. Marginal Way S., Seattle, WA 98134-2385. Submittals may be mailed to:

U.S. Army, Corps of Engineers, Seattle District
CENWS-CT-CB-MU, ATTN: Sherrye Schmahl
P.O. Box 3755, Seattle WA 98124-3755
(206) 764-6806

6. SELECTION OF FIRMS. Based on the assessment of the Phase One evaluation, the Contracting Officer will select the most highly qualified offerors, but not more than five (5) firms, that will be requested in writing to submit Phase Two proposals. It is anticipated that firms will be notified as to whether or not they are selected on or about **17 Nov 2005**. **This is a negotiated procurement and upon receipt of the initial submittals, no information will be provided to the public until a contract is awarded. No public notice stating the names of the selected firms will be published.**

7. NOTIFICATION TO FIRMS NOT SELECTED AND DEBRIEFINGS: Offerors who are not selected will be notified in writing. These offerors may request debriefings by submitting written requests to the Contracting Office within three (3) days after receipt of the notice of exclusion from the competition.

Copies of the Request for Proposals will be provided only to the firms selected in Phase One. The RFP package is expected to be issued on or about **22 Nov 2005**, with proposals due on or about **5 Jan 2006**. Approximately 15 days after the RFP issue date, the Government will

conduct a pre-proposal conference and site visit for the Pre-Qualified firms. The attached draft copy of Section 00110 is provided **for planning purposes only** by the contractor of what may be required for solicitation submittal in Phase Two and does not require any action for this Phase One submittal.

If you have any questions concerning this notice, please contact Sherrye Schmahl at (206) 764-6588, facsimile (206) 764-6817, or e-mail Sherrye.L.Schmahl@nws.usace.army.mil.

Sincerely,



ROSE N.S. OLDS
Contracting Officer

Attachments:

1. Customer Satisfaction Survey Form
2. Draft of Section 00110

CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY (PAGE 1 OF 2)

W912DW-05-R-0041 Design-Build: FY06 Squadron Operations Facility (SOF) Special Forces Group (SFG)
Compound Expansion, Fort Lewis, WA

SECTION 1 -- TO BE COMPLETED BY OFFEROR AND PROVIDED TO CUSTOMER REFERENCE

Name of Firm Being Evaluated: _____

Project Title & Location: _____

Project Dollar Value (for design-build, list both design and construction amounts)

Designer's Role on Project (if applicable): _____

Year Completed: _____ Project Manager: _____

SECTION 2 -- TO BE COMPLETED BY THE CUSTOMER REFERENCE AND MAILED, HAND-DELIVERED OR FAXED DIRECTLY TO: Forms submitted by other than the customer (i.e., by the offeror), will not be considered.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District FAX: (206) 764-6817
Attn: CENWS-CT-CB-MU (Sherrye Schmahl) Street Address:
P.O. Box 3755 4735 E. Marginal Way S.
Seattle, WA 98124-3755 Seattle WA 98134-2385

OVERVIEW: The firm shown above has submitted a proposal on a Seattle District Corps of Engineers project and provided your name as a customer reference. Part of our evaluation process requires information on the firm's past performance. Your input is important to us and responses are required by the date specified in the Phase One RFP letter for inclusion in this evaluation. Your assistance is greatly appreciated.

In blocks below, please indicate your overall level of satisfaction with work performed by firm shown in Section 1. Mark *Not Applicable* (N/A) for any areas that do not apply. Provide comments on page 2.

	On this project, the firm:	Satisfaction				
		Low	High			N/A
1.	Kept You Informed & Treated You as Important Member of the Team	1	2	3	4	5 N/A
2.	Displayed Flexibility in Responding to Your Needs	1	2	3	4	5 N/A
3.	Displayed Initiative in Problem Solving	1	2	3	4	5 N/A
4.	Resolved Your Concerns	1	2	3	4	5 N/A
5.	Completed Your Major Project Milestones on Time	1	2	3	4	5 N/A
6.	Managed the Project Effectively (including adequate Cost Controls)	1	2	3	4	5 N/A
7.	Managed their Work Force Effectively (including Subcontractors)	1	2	3	4	5 N/A
8.	Effectiveness of Quality Control Program	1	2	3	4	5 N/A
9.	Provided Warranty Support	1	2	3	4	5 N/A

W912DW-05-R-0041 Design-Build: FY06 Squadron Operations Facility (SOF) Special Forces Group (SFG)
Compound Expansion, Fort Lewis, WA

Your assistance in providing this past performance information is appreciated

DRAFT
PHASE TWO – SUBMISSION OF TECHNICAL AND PRICE PROPOSALS BY FIRMS
SELECTED IN PHASE ONE

1. INTRODUCTION: Each of the selected firms is invited to submit a proposal in response to Request for Proposals (RFP) No. W912DW-05-R-0041 entitled “FY 06 Special Operation Forces (SOF) Special Forces Group (SFG) Compound Expansion, Fort Lewis WA” This RFP establishes project design and construction criteria and provides procedures, requirements, format, and other data to assist offerors in preparing their proposals. **It is the intent of the Government to make award based upon initial offers, without further discussions or additional information.** A contract will be awarded to the firm submitting the proposal that conforms to the RFP, is considered to offer the most advantageous offer in terms of the evaluation factors, including price, and is determined to be in the best interest of the Government.

The RFP drawings, while provided for informational purposes only, illustrate required spacial and functional arrangements except as noted . The RFP drawings along with the statement of work will be referred to as illustrating the RFP basic design requirements. If the offeror proposes any substantial changes to the designs as depicted in the RFP drawings or as noted in the statement of work, the changes shall be specifically addressed and expanded upon in the offeror’s proposal.

2. PHASE 2 EVALUATION FACTORS:

2.1 Proposals will be evaluated on the basis of two criteria, **TECHNICAL** and **PRICE**. Award will be based upon evaluation of the following technical criteria listed in descending order of importance:

- A. Sustainability
- B. Extent of Small Business Participation

3. SUMMARY OF ORDER OF IMPORTANCE for Technical Criteria:

- Criterion A is significantly more important than criterion B.

4. TECHNICAL MERIT RATINGS: Technical proposals will be evaluated and rated for each criterion using the following adjectival descriptions:

OUTSTANDING - Information submitted demonstrates offeror’s potential to significantly exceed performance or capability standards. The offeror has clearly demonstrated an understanding of all aspects of the requirements to the extent that timely and the highest quality performance are anticipated. Has exceptional strengths that will significantly benefit the Government. The offeror convincingly demonstrated that the RFP requirements have been analyzed, evaluated, and synthesized into approaches, plans, and techniques that, when implemented, should result in outstanding, effective, efficient, and economical performance

under the contract. Significantly exceeds most or all solicitation requirements. **VERY HIGH PROBABILITY OF SUCCESS.**

ABOVE AVERAGE - Information submitted demonstrates offeror's potential to exceed performance or capability standards. Have one or more strengths that will benefit the Government. The areas in which the offeror exceeds the requirements are anticipated to result in a high level of efficiency or productivity or quality. The submittal contains excellent features that will likely produce results very beneficial to the Government. Fully meets all RFP requirements and significantly exceeds many of the RFP requirements. Disadvantages are minimal. **HIGH PROBABILITY OF SUCCESS.**

SATISFACTORY (Neutral) - Information submitted demonstrates offeror's potential to meet performance or capability standards. An acceptable solution is provided. Either meets all RFP requirements for the criterion or contains weaknesses in some areas that are offset by strengths in other areas. A rating of "Satisfactory" indicates that, in terms of the specific criterion (or sub-criterion), the offeror has a reasonable probability of success, as there is sufficient confidence that a fully compliant level of performance will be achieved. The proposal demonstrates an adequate understanding of the scope and depth of the RFP requirements. No significant advantages or disadvantages. Equates to neutral. **REASONABLE PROBABILITY OF SUCCESS.**

MARGINAL – The submittal is not adequately responsive or does not address the specific criterion. The offeror's interpretation of the Government's requirements is so superficial, incomplete, vague, incompatible, incomprehensible, or incorrect as to be considered deficient. Proposal does not meet some of the minimum requirements. The assignment of a rating within the bounds of "Marginal" indicates that mandatory corrective action would be required to prevent significant deficiencies from affecting the overall project. The offeror's plans or approach will likely result in questionable quality of performance, which represents a moderate level of risk to the Government. Low probability of success although the submittal has a reasonable chance of becoming at least acceptable. Significant disadvantages. **LOW PROBABILITY OF SUCCESS.**

UNSATISFACTORY – Fails to meet performance or capability standards. Unacceptable. Requirements can only be met with major changes to the submittal. There is no reasonable expectation that acceptable performance would be achieved. The proposal contains many deficiencies and/or gross omissions; fails to provide a reasonable, logical approach to fulfilling much of the Government's requirements; and/or fails to meet most or all of the minimum requirements. Very significant disadvantages. **VERY LOW PROBABILITY OF SUCCESS.**

5. Definitions of Strength, Weakness, and Deficiency:

Strength: A substantive aspect, attribute, or specific item in the proposal that exceeds the solicitation requirements and enhances the probability of successful contract performance.

Weakness: A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance (i.e., meets the RFP requirements, but may have an impact on schedule or quality requirements). A ***weakness need not be corrected*** for a proposal to be considered for award, but ***may*** affect the offeror's rating.

Deficiency: A material failure of a proposal to meet the Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of contract performance at an unacceptable level. A deficiency ***must be corrected*** for a proposal to be considered for award.

6. Submittal Requirements for Phase Two:

6.1 General Submittal Requirements for Phase Two:

Proposal Contents: Proposals shall be submitted in two parts: (a) Technical proposal and (b) Price proposal. Each part shall be submitted in a separate envelope/package, with the type of proposal (i.e., Technical or Price) clearly printed on the outside of the envelope/package.

NOTICE TO ALL FIRMS: The information provided for Phase One of this solicitation process regarding experience, qualifications and past performance is considered part of the firm's Technical proposal. No additional information shall be submitted for the evaluation factors listed for Phase One. For ease of evaluation, submit the proposal in the format as specified in paragraph 8.1 Written Technical Proposal and 9. Price Proposal Format.

6.1.1 Technical Proposal:

A **cover letter** should be the **first page** of the technical proposal and should include:

- (a) Solicitation number.
- (b) Name, address, and telephone and facsimile numbers of the firm signing the SF 1442 (and electronic address).
- (c) Names, titles and telephone and facsimile numbers (and electronic addresses) of persons authorized to negotiate on the firm's behalf with the Government in connection with this solicitation.
- (d) Name, title, and signature of the person authorized to sign the proposal.
- (e) A statement specifying agreement (see also (f) below) with all terms, conditions provisions included in the solicitation and agreement to furnish any and all items upon which prices are offered at the proposed item prices.
- (f) **Deviations From The RFP:** In the cover letter, firms shall specifically identify, in a section entitled "Deviations," any deviations from the minimum RFP requirements. All alternates shall be addressed and expanded upon in the firm's original proposal and any proposal revision.

(g) **Identification Of Items Exceeding RFP Requirements:** In an attachment to the cover letter, firms shall list all items exceeding the minimum RFP requirements. The list shall be entitled "IDENTIFICATION OF ITEMS EXCEEDING RFP REQUIREMENTS." All items listed shall be addressed and expanded upon in the firm's original proposal any proposal revision.

(h) **Final Proposal Revision:** If discussions are entered into and your firm is required to submit a final proposal revision, you must also send an accompanying cover letter shall identify all changes made to the firm's initial proposal along with any deviations from the RFP (per (f) above). In addition, firms shall attach a list (per (g) above) of any additional items exceeding the minimum RFP requirements. This list shall also include elimination of, or revisions to, those items previously identified as exceeding the RFP.

6.1.2 Technical Data furnished as part of the proposal shall meet all requirements of the RFP, design standards, technical specifications, and referenced regulations. Data shall be specific and complete, and demonstrate thorough understanding of the requirements. Data shall include, where applicable, complete explanations of procedures and the schedule the firm proposes to follow. Additionally, data shall demonstrate the merit of the technical approach offered and shall be an orderly, specific, and complete document in every detail.

6.1.3 Proposal information shall be submitted in standard letter, hardback loose-leaf binders with a table of contents. Contents of the binders shall be tabbed and labeled to afford easy identification. Contents shall follow the order of the evaluation criteria and pages shall be numbered. No material shall be incorporated by reference or reiteration of the RFP. Any such material will not be considered for evaluation. The technical proposal shall be presented in a manner that allows it to "**STAND ALONE**" without the need to reference other documents.

6.1.4 Firms submitting proposals should limit their submission to data essential for evaluation of proposals so that a minimum of time and money are expended.

6.1.5 Data submitted must reflect the designer's interpretation of criteria contained in the RFP.

6.1.6 Unnecessarily elaborate or voluminous brochures or other presentations, beyond those sufficient to present a complete and effective response, are not desired and may be construed as an indication of the firm's lack of cost-consciousness. Elaborate artwork, expensive paper and bindings, and expensive/extensive visual and other presentation aids are unnecessary.

6.1.7 Technical proposals will be evaluated for conformance with the minimum RFP criteria, and for the extent to which they exceed those criteria. While the intent is to keep the pre-award design effort to a minimum, proposals must provide adequate detail for evaluators to determine how the proposals meet or exceed the RFP criteria.

6.2 Specific Submittal requirements for Phase Two:

Sustainability has become a fundamental principle underlying successful building design and offers a critically important means for conserving our dwindling natural resources. Despite its growing acceptance, sustainable building design remains a complex undertaking and should be

considered in virtually every aspect of the design process. Fort Lewis has developed specific sustainability goals which it considers critical in its installation planning, development, management and operation activities. This RFP was developed with these goals in mind, and Offerors are encouraged to read "Chapter 13 Sustainable Design" of the Statement of Work (Section 00820 SOW) prior to preparing their proposals. It is imperative that Offerors not only gain an understanding of the extent of sustainable design techniques and technology to be considered and incorporated in this project but also the limitations and constraints imposed on sustainable design by mandatory design directives, cost and other considerations expressed within this SOW.

6.2.1 Criterion A - Sustainability: The Offerors shall submit separate LEED Project Checklists for the project site and for each building(s) with their proposals. The LEED Project Checklists for the various portions of the work are attached to SOW-G, SOW-B1, SOW-B2, SOW-B3, SOW-B4 and SOW-B5. These LEED Project Checklists identify the minimum credits to be achieved for each portion of the work. As stated in Chapter 13 of SOW-G, some LEED categories award potential points (credits) for strategies or decisions that are not within the control of the Contractor. Proposals shall address those areas where the Offeror is responsible to comply with the prerequisite requirements as provided in the RFP to achieve the minimum certification level. Offerors shall provide technical data and or descriptive information in their proposals indicating how they will achieve at the minimum credit points as identified on these checklists and elaborate on any areas where the Offeror intends to exceed the minimum certification level. The successful offeror shall be required to complete a detailed analysis during the project final design that meets or exceeds the preliminary ranking established at proposal level as specified in Chapter 13 of the SOW.

6.2.1.1 Minimum Submittal Requirements For Criterion A:

(a) Provide a narrative describing how sustainable design principles will be used in the design process for each discipline. The narrative shall address how environmental considerations will be integrated into the design to help conserve resources such as energy and water, reduce waste, maximize use of recovered and recycled materials, minimize the use of toxic and harmful substances in facility construction and operation, and develop safe and healthy living spaces. This narrative shall be keyed to the LEED Checklists for the various portions of the work as noted in paragraph 7.2.1 above.

(b) Provide a list of recovered/recycled materials proposed for use in the performance of the contract. Recovered materials shall be used to the maximum extent practicable. Practicable is defined (per 40 CFR CH.1, 247.3) as capable of being used consistent with (a) performance in accordance with applicable specifications, and (b) availability at a reasonable price, availability within a reasonable period of time, and maintenance of a satisfactory level of competition. See Section 00800 in the RFP for list of EPA designated items and their definitions.

6.2.1.2 Evaluation Method: Evaluation will be based on how well the design will integrate the use of sustainable design principles, the process by which the design and construction will promote the principle of responsible stewardship of the environment, the extent of use of recovered and recycled materials and ease of operation and maintenance.

6.2.2 Criterion B - Extent of Small Business Participation

6.2.2.1 Minimum Submittal Requirements For Criterion D:

No submittal is required for this criterion. The Government will utilize performance evaluations contained in CCASS to evaluate this criterion.

6.2.2.2 Evaluation Method: Firms will be evaluated for the success and extent of their small business participation in their subcontracting with small and disadvantaged business concerns. Firms will be evaluated based on the ratings received for item entitled "Implementation of Subcontracting Plan" on their past performance evaluations retrieved from the CCASS System. Firms without any evaluations in CCASS, or for which this item was not evaluated (i.e., N/A), will be assigned a neutral rating of satisfactory. Firms that receive a rating below satisfactory for this item in one or more CCASS evaluations will receive a rating of marginal for this criterion.

7. TECHNICAL PROPOSAL FORMAT:

7.1 WRITTEN TECHNICAL PROPOSAL. As a minimum, each copy of the technical proposal should contain the following general format for the volumes specified in the following table. Pages should be numbered consecutively throughout the technical proposal.

Technical Proposal (original and 10 copies required): (Only one original is required for the color and materials board).

Technical Proposal Cover Letter

Table of Contents (List all sections of the technical proposal)

Sustainability

8. PRICE PROPOSAL FORMAT:

8.1 The price proposal shall be submitted in ORIGINAL only, and must be signed by an official authorized to bind your organization. Note that the Standard Form 1442, Block 13D states the minimum number of calendar days after the date offers are due for Government acceptance of the offer. All amendments must be acknowledged on Standard Form 1442 BACK by date and number in Block 19 or by telegram. Provide the name, point of contact, phone number, and address for bank and bonding company of firm signing SF 1442.

8.2 **Bid Bonds** must be accompanied by a **Power of Attorney containing an original signature from the surety**, which must be affixed to the Power of Attorney after the Power of Attorney has been generated. Computer generated and signed Powers of Attorney will only be accepted if accompanied by an original certification from a current officer of the surety attesting to its authenticity and continuing validity. Performance and payment bonds have the same requirement.

8.3 **Small Business Subcontracting. Large businesses are required to submit a subcontracting plan** (See FAR Clause 52.219-9 Alt II, Small Business Subcontracting Plan, Jan 2002) with initial price proposals. Award will not be made under this solicitation without an

approved subcontracting plan. See the "Notice to Large Business Firms" located in the front of this solicitation.

8.4 Joint Ventures. No contract may be awarded to a joint venture that is not registered in the Central Contractor Register (CCR). Joint ventures may register in the following way:

(a) The firm that will be the recipient of payments should be registered in the CCR and have a DUNS number. This firm is considered in the CCR to be the "mother firm." If no money is to go to any other firm in the joint venture, the mother firm may make the other firm in the joint venture a "child." This child will be assigned the mother firm's CCR number with an additional four (4) numbers attached. Since the child firm is not receiving any payments, they do not need to get a DUNS number. HOWEVER, in order to cover all possibilities, it might be advisable to have each firm registered in the CCR.

(b) Call the CCR at 1-888-227-2423, choose option "0" to get the mother –child relationship set up. DUN & Bradstreet phone number is 1-800-333-0505.

(c) If the joint venture has a newly created name, then it must have its own DUNS number and register as such in the CCR.

8.4.1 In the cover letter of your proposal, provide the complete names, addresses, and phone and fax numbers of the two firms in the joint venture.

8.4.2 Signature requirements: SF 1442, SOLICITATION, OFFER, AND AWARD (pages 00010-1 and 00010-2), Block 20 requires that the name and title of the person authorized to sign the offer for the joint venture be provided.

8.4.3 Corporate certificate: Ensure that joint-venture portion is completed by both firms.

8.4.4 In the case of a joint venture, the following is required: A contract with joint venturers may involve any combination of individuals, partnerships, or corporations. The contract shall be signed by each participant in the joint venture in the manner prescribed below for each type of participant. When a corporation is participating, the Contracting Officer shall verify that the corporation is authorized to participate in the joint venture.

(a) Individuals. A contract with an individual shall be signed by that individual. A contract with an individual doing business as a firm shall be signed by that individual, and the signature shall be followed by the individual's types, stamped, or printed name and the words "an individual doing business as" [insert name of firm].

(b) Partnerships. A contract with a partnership shall be signed in the partnership name. Before signing for the Government, the Contracting Officer shall obtain a list of all partners and ensure that the individual(s) signing for the partnership have authority to bind the partnership.

(c) Corporations. A contract with a corporation shall be signed in the corporate name, followed by the word "by" and the signature and title of the person authorized to sign. The

Contracting Officer shall ensure that the person signing for the corporation has authority to bind the corporation.

8.4.5 In addition to the requirements stated above, and to assure a single point of contact for resolution of contractual matters and payments, the Contracting Officer shall obtain a certificate signed by each participant in the joint venture as follows: In the proposal include the following statement:

“The parties hereto expressly understand and agree as follows:

a. **(name, title, and company)** is the principal representative of the joint venture. As such, all communications regarding the administration of the contract and the performance of the work thereunder may be directed to him or her. In the absence of **(same name, title, and company)**, **(enter name, title, and company of alternate)** is the alternate principal representative of the joint venture.

b. Direction, approvals, required notices, and all other communications from the Government to the joint venture, including transmittal of payments by the Government, shall be directed to **(enter name, title, and company of principal)**, principal representative of the joint venture.”

8.4.6 The bid bond form, Block “Principal” requires that the name and title of the person authorized to sign for the joint venture be included.

8.4.7 After award, the performance and payment bonds, and the insurance certificate(s) provided shall be in the name of the joint venture.

9. **DESIGN TO BUILD.** The estimated design to build price for this project is \$16.2M.

10. **FUNDING.** The total amount of funds available for the design and construction of this project is specified in the Schedule. Offerors should design and construct to this funding limit.

11. **EVALUATION AND AWARD PROCEDURES**

11.1 TECHNICAL EVALUATION:

11.1.1 Technical proposals will be evaluated by a Technical Evaluation Team (TET) comprised of representatives of the Corps of Engineers and the Using Agency. Pricing data will not be considered during this evaluation. Criteria for the technical evaluation set forth in this RFP will be the sole basis for determining the technical merit of proposals.

11.1.2 The TET shall utilize the relative importance definitions and technical merit ratings described earlier in this section of the solicitation to perform their technical evaluation.

11.1.3 To be considered for award, proposals must conform to the terms and conditions contained in the RFP. No proposal will be accepted that does not address all criteria specified in

this solicitation or which includes stipulations or qualifying conditions unacceptable to the Government.

11.2 PRICE EVALUATION:

Price is of secondary importance to the technical criteria. Pricing will be independently evaluated to determine reasonableness and to aid in the determination of the firm's understanding of the work and ability to perform the contract. Financial capacity and bonding ability will be verified.

11.3 SELECTION AND AWARD:

11.3.1 Subject to provisions contained herein, award of a firm-fixed price contract shall be made to a single firm. The Government will select the best value offer based on technical merit and price.

11.3.2 Best Value Analysis. The Government is more concerned with obtaining superior technical features than with making award at the lowest overall cost to the Government. In determining the best value to the Government, the tradeoff process of evaluation will be utilized. The tradeoff process permits tradeoffs between price and technical criterion, and allows the Government to consider award to other than the lowest priced offeror or other than the highest technically rated offeror. You are advised that greater consideration will be given to the evaluation of technical proposals rather than price. It is pointed out, however, that should technical competence between offerors be considered approximately the same, the cost or price could become more important in determining award.

11.3.3 Selection and Award Without Discussions: It is the intent of the Government to make award based upon initial offers, without further discussions or additional information. Therefore, initial proposals should be submitted based on the most favorable terms from a price and technical standpoint. Do not assume there will be an opportunity to clarify, discuss or revise proposals. If award is not made on initial offers, discussions will be conducted as described below.

11.3.4 Competitive Range: If it is not in the Government's best interest to make award on initial offers, the Contracting Officer will establish a competitive range of one or more offers and conduct discussions with those firms. When determining the competitive range, the Contracting Officer will consider the technical ratings and prices offered.

11.3.5 Discussions: Discussions are usually conducted in writing, but may also be by telephone or in person. Discussions are tailored to each offeror's proposal and are only conducted with offeror(s) in the competitive range. The primary objective of discussions is to maximize the Government's ability to obtain the best value, based on the requirement and the evaluation criteria set forth in this solicitation. If a firm's proposal is eliminated or otherwise removed from consideration for award during discussions, no further revisions to that firm's proposal will be accepted or considered. Discussions will culminate in a request for Final Proposal Revision the date and time of which will be common to all remaining firms.

11.3.6 After Discussions: Revisions to the proposals submitted during discussions, if any, will be evaluated by the TET and, if warranted, an adjustment made to the rating previously assigned. The Contracting Officer will then perform a best value analysis based on the final prices and technical proposals. Selection will be made on the basis of the responsive, responsible firm whose proposal conforms to the RFP and represents the most advantageous offer to the Government, subject to availability of funds.

11.3.7 Debriefings: Upon written request, unsuccessful firms will be debriefed and furnished the basis for the selection decision and contract award in accordance with FAR 15.505 and FAR 15.506.

11.3.8 Proposal Expenses and Pre-contract Costs: This solicitation does not commit the Government to pay costs incurred in preparation and submission of initial and subsequent proposals or for other costs incurred prior to award of a formal contract.

11.3.9 Release of Information: After receipt of proposals and until contract award, source selection information will not be furnished to any firm.

END OF INTRODUCTORY SECTION OF TEXT TO SECTION 00110